



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Green IHRD

Citation for published version:

Valentin, C 2017, Green IHRD: Sustainability and environmental issues. in T Garavan, A McCarthy & R Carbery (eds), *Handbook of International Human Resource Development: Context, Processes and People* . vol. 1, Chapter 8, Edward Elgar, pp. 171-193. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781954188>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.4337/9781781954188](https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781954188)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Published In:

Handbook of International Human Resource Development

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is a draft chapter that has been accepted for publication by Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd in the book Handbook of International HRD: Context, Processes and People edited by Thomas Garavan, Alma McCarthy and Ronan Carbery, published in 2017.

<http://www.e-elgar.com/shop/handbook-of-international-human-resource-development>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Garavan, T., McCarthy, A. & Carbery, R. (Eds) (2017) *A Handbook of International HRD: Context, Processes and People*, Edward Elgar

Green IHRD: Sustainability and Environmental Issues

Claire Valentin

Introduction

There has been a growing interest in environmentally conscious or 'green' HRD practice, but green international HRD (IHRD) has to date been under-researched. Green IHRD is concerned with IHRD interventions to facilitate individual learning and organizational development which contribute to sustainable international organizational policies and practices. Sustainable organizational practices and policies should increase the positive environmental impact and decrease the negative environmental and social consequences of organizational behaviours. Learning is central to developing organizational sustainability, and IHRD practitioners can play a key role in the education of employees on green issues (Williams & Turnbull 2015). IHRD with its focus on learning and development is ideally placed to play a central role in organizational sustainability, to support learning for and about sustainability within organizations.

Sustainability has increasingly become a strategic issue for organizations, and thus needs a strategic focus from IHRD. IHRD risks becoming marginalised if it does not develop a strategic role in the development and implementation of sustainability policies and practices (Harris & Tregidga 2012). However, sustainability presents challenges to the some of the premises underpinning IHRD. Whereas a strategic IHRD suggests a focus on the requirements for organizational success, a sustainability focus on the triple bottom line (Elkington, 2004) looks beyond the organization, to society and to the environment. Sustainability requires approaches which encourages learning about new things and learning in new ways (Valentin 2015).

This chapter presents some ways of thinking about green IHRD. A conceptual framework for green IHRD is presented, which highlights how competing ways of thinking about sustainability are reflected in differing organizational and IHRD practices. Some lessons for IHRD are drawn out, and suggestion for a future research and practice agenda. The chapter draws on literature on HRD and sustainability, HRM literature which has an

international focus on sustainability and learning and development, literatures on sustainability and learning, and on critical management research.

The chapter first examines the construct of green HRD, and then goes on to draw out the key features of green IHRD, through the lens of a conceptual framework, which identifies three orientations to green IHRD. These three orientations are then examined in some detail, exploring how they could be reflected in different aspects of the practice of green IHRD. This is followed by a discussion on the implications for IHRD research and practice, and final conclusions are then drawn.

Defining Green HRD

This section will examine definitions and components of sustainable development, and explore the various approaches that HRD scholars have taken to examining the role of HRD in sustainability.

Sustainable development has been defined as 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Sustainable development addresses concerns such as the protection of the diversity and richness of natural resources, conservation of non-renewable natural resources, and maintaining the integrity of sensitive ecosystems (Shrivastava, 1995). It requires the organization to focus on environmental and social value as well as economic value, commonly referred to as the 'triple bottom line' (TBL) of profits, people, and planet (Slaper and Hall, 2011).

The main contribution of HRD is to support the organization towards sustainability, through its focus on individual and organizational learning, change and development (Sadler-Smith 2015). HRD can contribute towards building organizational capabilities for change in economic, social and environmental terms (Colbert & Kurucz 2007). Moving towards sustainability requires new conceptual knowledge, management knowledge, and practical knowledge (Fenwick 2007). Implementing sustainable development may require organizational culture change, the development of new leadership competencies, changes in staff awareness and knowledge, and new behaviours (Rimanoczy & Pearson, 2010). As Siebenhuner & Arnold (2007, p. 340) note, 'processes and products need to be re-invented, controlling systems have to integrate new sets of data, external and internal communication strategies require revisions and basic values and knowledge systems need to adapt'. HRD

can contribute insights into systems change, human capacity and performance development, and the development of leaders' knowledge and skill (Scully-Russ 2012). Haddock et al (2010) see green HRD aligning economic, environmental and social growth, through 'a cyclic process of continuous development and transformation of self, others and the organization' (Haddock et al 2010, p.3).

HRD authors have addressed green HRD from a number of perspectives. Some have sought to deepen understanding of HRD sustainability practices. Garavan and McGuire (2010) explore HRD's role in embedding corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainability in organizations; Garavan et al (2010) explore behavioural barriers to CSR. Others present guidance on implementation of green HRD practices. McGuire (2014) presents a model of green HRD, which proposes 6 R's of sustainable environmental activity – reduce, reuse, recycle, redesign, renew, re-educate. Over-arching this is the need for green leadership, communication, and the promotion of shared environmental vision in the organization. Others have sought to develop conceptual understandings of green HRD. Ardichvili (2013) provides a conceptual framework incorporating corporate social responsibility (CSR), corporate sustainability, and business ethics, linked in a triad, and argues that analysis is needed at the level of the individual, the organization, and society; Scully-Russ (2015) provides a green HRD conceptual framework incorporating three types of knowledge (performative, narrative and scientific), which stressed a multidisciplinary approach to understanding, noting dynamic tensions between competing knowledges.

Having examined the concept of green HRD, the following section explores how this informs the components of green IHRD.

Identifying the Components of Green IHRD

This section examines green HRD from the perspective of IHRD. It draws on a number of relevant conceptions of green HRD to create a conceptual framework for green IHRD. This framework informs the remainder of the chapter.

Whilst there is increasing focus on green HRD, much of which is of relevance to IHRD, to date there has been little focus in the HRD literature on green IHRD. The international focus potentially presents a wide agenda for green IHRD. The IHRD contribution to sustainability is linked to the status, roles, strategies and practices of HRD in

individual organizations, at different developmental stages, operating in varying business environments. Sustainable practice needs to be contextualized within the organization, the business and national/international context. Whilst there can be no blueprints or standard practices for green IHRD, a key focus of IHRD, organizational learning, provides a central platform for developing green IHRD.

Conceptual frameworks on green HRD and on IHRD developed by a number of HRD scholars provide a basis for mapping the components of green IHRD. Valentin (2015) proposes a Triple Bottom Line conceptual framework for framing HRD and sustainability with respect to practice, teaching and research. Drawing on Habermas's (1972) three knowledge constitutive interests, 'technical', 'practical' and 'emancipatory' reasoning, she identifies three orientations for organizational and HRD responses to sustainability, 'Compliance', 'Cooperation' and 'Co-existence'. Organizational 'Compliance' with environmental regulations and a shareholder locus, with an HRD input of training, is a necessary but limited response. A 'Cooperation' orientation involves HRD stimulating a more questioning and awareness raising approach, and taking a wider stakeholder perspective towards the challenges presented by sustainability, emphasizing the need for deep learning. An orientation of 'Co-existence' recognizes that the complex challenges of sustainability involve a problem-posing approach for HRD.

Garavan & McGuire (2010) propose the HRD contribution to sustainability operates across three levels: foundation - building foundations for sustainability; traction - gaining a foothold for sustainability in the organization; and integration – where sustainability is fully integrated into the organization. They suggest that the challenge for HRD is to support the organization to move through these stages, to develop an integrated approach to sustainability, representing a move from a functionalist to a learning approach.

From the perspective of IHRD, Anderson (2015) identifies three distinct but overlapping conceptions in examining HRD and offshore outsourcing – tactical, strategic, and transformational. For both Anderson and Garavan and McGuire's frameworks, moving from one stage to the next is not an inevitable trajectory, as it may involve radically different approaches. This suggests a continuum of practices for IHRD, characterized by different underpinning ideological assumptions.

Drawing on Valentin (2015), Garavan and McGuire (2010) and Anderson (2015), a conceptual framework for green IHRD is proposed (Figure 1). The Green IHRD Conceptual Framework identifies three orientations to green HRD: Tactical Green IHRD,

Strategic Green IHRD, and Transformational Green IHRD. 6 aspects of green IHRD are posited, which identify underpinning assumptions about the organization with respect to sustainability, the locus of stakeholder engagement, and how this translates into IHRD practice. The six foci are: knowledge constitutive interest, sustainability conceptualization, stakeholder focus, HRD focus, HRD practice, and learning focus. These are elaborated upon in the following sections. The thinking and practice of HRD is examined, and key arguments as to the potential and the limitations of each orientation.

	IHRD sustainability orientations		
	Tactical Green IHRD	Strategic Green IHRD	Transformational Green IHRD
Knowledge constitutive interest	Technical reason	Practical reason	Emancipatory reason
Sustainability conceptualization	Legal compliance, Bounded rationality Consensus	Triple bottom line, Accomodation discourse	Eco-consciousness, Embedded sustainability Wicked problems
Stakeholder focus	Shareholder focus	Stakeholder focus-organisation/ business stakeholders	Broad stakeholder focus, Networks, alliances, fuzzy boundaries
IHRD focus	CSR, Sustainability, ethics, Problem solving, HRD as a business service	Strategic HRD	HRD as sustainability leader
IHRD practice	Pragmatism, information, recycling, training, CSR Framework	Principle, awareness raising, development, best practice,	Problem posing, challenge, critique. Exploratory Dissensus
Learning focus	Single-loop learning Descriptive	Single and double-loop learning, questioning Prescriptive, explanatory	Deutero learning. Collaborative learning Reflexivity, problematization. Multidisciplinary

Table 1. Green IHRD Conceptual Framework.

Green IHRD Conceptual Framework

This section examines the different components of the green IHRD conceptual framework. The three proposed orientations to green IHRD – tactical, strategic, and transformational are explained and the HRD role is explored, including how this manifests itself in IHRD practices and interventions. Each section is followed by a critique of the particular orientation.

Tactical green IHRD.

Knowledge constitutive interest

Technical reason focuses on means to secure ends that prioritize the interests of the organization. Wilmott (2003 p. 96) notes that the the technical interest 'prioritises prediction and control over natural and social forces, concentrating on improving efficiency and effectiveness'. Technical reason in IHRD focuses on more effective and efficient ways to enhance the interests of the organization.

Sustainability conceptualization

Sustainability in this context focuses on the relationship between economic outcomes and sustainability outcomes, with the aim to increase efficiency of resource exploitation via innovation (Kramar, 2014). The triple bottom line is addressed from the perspective of enlightened self-interest (Kopnina, 2013). Organizational practice might include compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, and a focus on sustainability to the extent that the company can carry out its business as usual.

Simon's (1991) concept of 'bounded rationality' argues that decision makers face limitations both in the information available to them, and their cognitive and temporal ability to handle its complexity, and thus can only review a limited range of factors and possibilities (Clegg, Kornberger & Pitsis, 2008, p. 286). In conditions of uncertainty, the most appropriate decisions are those that are both sufficient and satisfying rather than optimally rational, referred to as 'satisficing' (Clegg et al., 2008). Thus managers may make decisions that serve to satisfy the commercial needs of the organization to maximize shareholder value, but tend to be focused on short-term results (Garrity, 2012).

Stakeholder focus

The shareholder perspective on management sees the main role of the firm is to maximize shareholder value. Stakeholder engagement with respect to environmental issues aims to minimize any adverse impacts on the profitability of the firm, or maximize benefit to the firm. This might include paying attention to local stakeholders of a global firm, and international bodies requiring compliance with regulations.

IHRD focus

The IHRD role is predominantly one of business service, providing support for the organization to start to focus on reducing waste, reusing and recycling, and development of a corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainability policies, and environmental education for staff. The IHRD contribution is functionalist and emphasizes performance, focused on the needs of the marketplace and the agenda of profitability (Garavan and McGuire, 2010; Kramar, 2014). The IHRD focus may be on leadership roles for increasing sustainability, facilitating communication and coordination across geographically dispersed organizations (Gubbins & Garavan 2009).

IHRD practice

HRD practice takes a largely 'training' focus (McCracken & Wallace, 2000), for example training about regulatory requirements and technical standards, and to develop relevant technical skills. Training would aim to increase employee awareness of the organization's environmental goals and strategy (Jackson et al 2011). It would provide training on the social and environmental responsibilities of the organization, present the business case for sustainability, and implement IHRD practices and support culture changes to further the company's business and sustainability goals (Lockwood, 2004; Schramm, 2008).

The IHRD role includes developing employees' cultural competence, expatriate manager training in cultural awareness and ethics, development of global managers, developing communication skills, working with a cross functional teams (Garavan & McGuire 2010, Gubbins & Garavan (2009). Sustainability would be mapped onto these activities. Employee training in environmental management would focus on such things as: increasing staff awareness of the organizational environmental impact and 'eco-literacy'; developing skills, such as collecting waste data; training for green jobs (Redwick, Redman & Maguire, 2013).

Learning focus

In terms of organizational learning for sustainability, when operating within the shareholder paradigm, organizational learning is inwardly focused, predominantly displaying mechanistic single loop learning, which leads to behaviour change but without challenging basic organizational assumptions about the organizational role with respect to sustainability (Neale, 1997). Thus the organization adapts to the changing regulatory, commercial or consumer environments, not from any deep ethical commitment to sustainability, but purely from the commercial concern.

Critique of Tactical Green IHRD

IHRD certainly needs to be business focused – the business partner model is well established, and practitioners of IHRD need to develop a high level of business literacy to effectively engage in the full role of IHRD. The shareholder model suggested here may also incorporate a high level of analysis and understanding of organizational stakeholders, the better to understand the sustainability concerns of customers, for example. However, the prime purpose is seen to satisfy shareholder value; the shareholder model puts the needs of the business to the fore. The strategic IHRD role is a unitarist one of supporting the bottom line of economic success within the market (Parkes and Borland 2012).

Decisions made without any deep ethical commitment to environmental stewardship can result in a façade of ‘green washing’. Jermier & Forbes (2003 p. 166) comment on ‘*ceremonial greening*....public, ceremonial displays, obscuring the alternative reality of organizational minimalism, inaction or even malfeasance’.

Bounded rationality helps decision-makers to focus on solutions to complex and intractable problems presented by sustainability, but a seemingly ‘win-win’ case does not in fact guarantee the identification of the most sustainable strategy options (Hahn and Figge, (2011). Organizational *satisficing* does not sufficiently take into account the impact on the wider environment or community, or focus on the longer term public interest. A bounded notion of instrumentality ‘establishes a systematic a-priori predominance of economic organizational outcomes over environmental and social aspects’ (Hahn & Figge, 2011, p. 325). This ‘business as usual’ world view is ‘technocentric’ and will do little to address the deep and complex problems associated with a concern for sustainability (Kurucz, Colbert & Marcus, 2014); Kopnina, 2013, p. 52). For example, a recent study (Carrington, 2016) warns of the risks to the financial economy from climate change, but noted that awareness in the financial sector was low. The following two perspectives move the focus beyond the needs of the business to that of the wider context of stakeholders and the environment.

Strategic Green IHRD

Knowledge constitutive interest

Practical reason focuses on the facilitation of communication and advancement of mutual understanding, to gain appreciation of differing perspectives and experiences. For sustainability, IHRD looks beyond the narrow confines of market forces to see the organization as part of a wider environmental and social context.

Sustainability conceptualization

A strategic approach to sustainability recognises interconnection and interaction of stakeholders, organization and the environment, which incorporates organization performance measures to encompass 'employee well-being, community well-being and quality of life' (Kramar, 2014, p.1072). It looks beyond profit maximization to focus on social and environmental values, and moral obligations to all those who have a stake in the business (Mankin, 2009). It should seek to cultivate a *corporate conscience*, and pay 'balanced attention to environmental, economic and social elements of the system' (Ardichvili, 2013, p. 457).

Stakeholder focus

The sustainability focus sees the organization within a wider context of stakeholders. A stakeholder orientation to management argues that an organization needs to pay attention to relationships with a wide range of people or groups who may be able to influence or who are affected by its activities, both internal and external, and direct and indirect stakeholders. In contrast to a shareholder focus solely on finance and performance, the organization acknowledges responsibility for people and environments affected by its actions (Fenwick and Bierema, 2008). Hatcher (2002) suggests seeing the environment as a stakeholder. IHRD is expected to balance a competing set of stakeholder demands (MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery (2012 p.354). A stakeholder-based IHRD respects the plurality of stakeholder interests, earns legitimacy from various internal and external stakeholders, and recognizes the interdependency of stakeholder interests (Baek & Kim 2014).

IHRD focus

A strategic approach to IHRD assumes that HRD activities need to be integrated with organization strategic objectives, and that HRD activities contribute to organizational

performance. As MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery (2012) argue, 'the shift from operational and tactical HRD to strategic HRD has witnessed a metamorphosis for HRD practitioners increasingly becoming partners in the business tasked with aligning people, strategy and performance rather than simply promoting learning and development' (MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery 2012:354).

IHRD focuses on enhancing global effectiveness through organizational structures and systems to enable global integration and local responsiveness; this gains a further dimension, that of sustainability. Sustainability becomes part of the cultural 'corporate glue' (Harris, Brewster and Sparrow 2003) needed to create a unified sense of mission around a wider vision of the organization.

IHRD practice

A strategic IHRD focused on sustainability needs to account for stakeholder influences, and work with stakeholders to advance sustainability goals. This entails organizational monitoring and cooperation with external agencies. HRD can position itself in a leadership role in the organization with respect to sustainability (Garavan & McGuire 2010). The well-established literature on strategic HRD that can be adopted to focus on a strategic approach to sustainability. Stakeholder analysis, organizational and environmental analysis, goal setting, partnership approaches, can all be infused with a focus on sustainability, as well as form the basis for developing green HRD strategies.

Green HRD practices are enhanced by specialized and customized environmental training, linked to a focus on organizational culture and teamwork, including the development of 'green teams' with enhanced ability to deal with emerging issues related to sustainability (Cherian & Jacob, 2012).

There is an important role for leadership development, developing leadership capacity towards sustainability alignment objectives. Development processes (mentoring, career development) should be informed by sustainability intentions, and focus on capacity building, and skill-building towards sustainability objectives (Colbert & Kurucz, 2007). Commitment from senior management is important (Cherian & Jacob, 2012). Garavan, et al (2010) note the importance of supervisory support to influence employees' attitudes towards environmental initiatives. Attention needs to be paid to organizational-level factors such as culture and climate, structures, teamwork, senior management values and leadership. Environmental training and education and establishing a culture of employee accountability for environmental outcomes help the development of green practices (Jackson et al 2011).

The capabilities required to manage ecological outcomes of decisions need to be identified. Capabilities 'include systems thinking, teamwork, critical thinking, reflection, collaboration, individual self-knowledge and awareness of values' (Kramar 2014p.1074-5) can be reflected in competency frameworks and staff development initiatives.

Learning focus

This suggests a more questioning and awareness raising focus for HRD, to align with a broader strategic HRD focus. As Neale (1997) notes, environmental innovation needs organizational learning, and enhanced capacity for engagement and collaboration with external stakeholders. Double-loop learning is necessary for critical reflection on the values, policies, principles and procedures of an organization, and innovation may require radical change such as a major change in strategic direction (Cramer, 2005). As Smith (2012) notes 'the more complex, dynamic, turbulent, and threatening the organization's environment, the more necessary double-loop learning is considered to be' (p. 6).

The strategic focus for HRD is to facilitate and support a learning culture and 'foster reflection, creativity, and continuous learning' (Ardichvili, 2013, p. 460). Ardichvili (2013) notes that this goes beyond awareness-raising through training and programmes, to the 'development of ethical and responsible organizational cultures as a result of long-term change efforts, involving, among other things, redesigned formal and informal processes and routines' (p. 459).

Sustainability-focused organizational learning requires organizations to question core business practices and values. Creating opportunities for social learning and engagement with stakeholders is important (Garavan et al 2010). The IHRD contribution focuses on developing understanding, encourages questioning, deepening knowledge of arguments for environmentalism, for example. It moves beyond a focus on the interests of the organization, to encourage debate on the relationship of business with wider society and the environment, and practical and moral dilemmas that arise.

Critique of Strategic Green IHRD

Sustainable HRD presents a challenge to the IHRD business partner role, where this focuses solely on how HRD interventions contribute to business outcomes (Kramar, 2014). It highlights the moral dimensions and underpinning purposes of HRD, and recognise that there are 'ambiguities, paradoxes and dilemmas' in practice (Kramar, 2014, p.1073).

The strategic IHRD focus however is predominantly a functional one which prioritises organizational efficiency and performance, an 'economic-centric orientation of HRD interventions' (MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery (2012 p.357). SHRD has been criticised for this close alignment to market needs, resulting in a short-term focus on performance and profitability (Garavan & McGuire 2010). MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery (2012) note, 'the close alignment of HRD practices and interventions with organizations goals may detach HRD practitioners from their espoused values' (p. 354). They argue that the business partner role of close alignment of HRD strategy with organizational strategy aimed at competitive advantage may result in exclusion of an HRD focus on environmental concerns. Short-term businesses pressures may make it difficult for IHRD practitioners to balance diverse stakeholder demands.

The concept of sustainable development is an 'accommodation discourse', which aims to balance the needs of the company, society and the environment. However, this notion of balance operates assumes no change to the overall frameworks of consumer capitalism (Newton, 2009). The accommodation approach tends to focus on the cost-benefit analysis of how greening can enhance competitiveness (Jermier & Forbes, 2003). This ecological modernization paradigm has emphasized win-win perspectives, seeking profitability and sustainability at the same time (Ahlstrom, Maquet and Richter, 2009). 'Thus, *sustainable development as it is now conceived is simply another business strategy that enables more growth*' (Garrity, 2012, p. 2461, italics in original). In the global corporation, resources, both human and natural, 'are exploited in the service of accumulation imperatives' (Jermier and Forbes 2003 p. 161). This results in a 'sustainability paradox', where 'our dominant approaches to wealth creation degrades both the ecological systems and the social relationships upon which their very survival depends' (Kurucz et al., 2014, p. 438). Unless the organization focuses on the wider context, ultimately (and ironically) a shareholder focus hastens the inevitability of adverse environmental conditions impacting on the ability of the organization to carry out its business.

In practice shareholder expectations may not coincide with sustainability initiatives and discourage managers from taking a proactive approach to sustainability (Quairel-Lanoizelee, 2011; Garrity, 2012, p. 84). Competition acts as a constraint on the social and environmental policies. The discourse of balance downplays and disguises political power, institutional influence, self-interest, stock market pressures and the drive for profit that operates on organizations (Sanders 2012). Whilst paying attention to stakeholders, shareholder theory still operates as the predominant business model, and ecological criteria take second place to the priority of profit maximization to optimize shareholder wealth

(Jermier & Forbes, 2003; Neilsen, 2003). These pressures are often not disclosed in company environmental reporting, which show only the positive information on CSR (Quairel-Lanoizelee, 2011).

Transformational green IHRD.

Knowledge constitutive interest

Emancipatory reason is concerned to develop deep understanding of structures of relations of power and domination (Willmott, 2003). The traditional growth model of competition encourages expanding consumption and consumerism; as argued by Shrivastava (1995) sustainability requires approaches to economic development which re-conceptualize the relationship between society and nature. This requires the development of deep understanding, questioning of underlying values and assumptions in society and organization, creation of new mental models, and deep systemic organizational change (Scully-Russ, 2012).

Sustainability conceptualization

Sustainability presents *wicked problems*, ones where different parties may have different perspectives on both problem identification and solutions. Sadler-Smith (2015) for example highlight the difficulties with predicting the passage and impact of global warming. Tipping points may result in changes in the natural environment which are irreversible, leading to the need for humans to adapt to a new, possible disadvantageous, equilibrium.

‘Wicked problems suffer from a chronic lack of problem definition, the problem boundary and relation to other social issues requiring input, and unrepeatable solutions’ (Castle & Culver, 2013, p. 36). Solutions cannot simply accommodate different perspectives, and need to focus on disagreements as well as areas of agreement.

Some critique the notion of ‘development’ itself. Kopnina (2013) argues that modernity’s emphasis on progress subjects nature to an economic valuation, rather than other types of value, creating an imbalance between humans and the environment. Thus sustainable development is an anthropocentric notion, concerned for quality of life for current and future generations of humans, in contrast to ecocentric notions and deep green views (Hahn & Figge, 2011). Kurucz et al. (2014) see this as an ethos of human domination, and argue this needs to be transformed ‘into one of co-evolution of human development and biospheric integrity’ (p. 443). Gladwin, Kennelly and Krause (1995) however argue that an

ecocentric paradigm diminishes human distinctiveness, and propose a *sustaincentric* rather than a sustainability paradigm, which is both people and conservation based.

Stakeholder focus

A broad stakeholder focus takes in not only the stakeholders who have direct relationships with the business, but spreads out to a deeper network of relevant stakeholders. This might include representatives of the environmental movement, for example. Informal networks and alliances with community groups, trade unions and environmental activists go beyond the traditional pool of organization stakeholders, as noted by Fenwick (2007).

IHRD focus

From the transformational green IHRD orientation the goal is to embed sustainability into organizational and IHRD practices. Equipping people in organizations to face the complex challenges of sustainability requires a problem posing approach for HRD, which facilitates deep questioning and change. The IHRD role is to foster deep organizational learning, to support creativity, leadership and problem solving skills, the development of expertise in management of learning, surfacing implicit knowledge, and sharing best practice behaviours (Gloet, 2006). Enabling interdisciplinary and intersectoral discussion can help to expose gaps and highlight different perspectives and facilitate the development of a shared vocabulary to address wicked problems.

The organizational role of IHRD professionals means that they are well placed to become sustainability leaders (Ferdig, 2007). IHRD initiatives can foster the corporate focus on sustainability, broadening the strategic frame of reference of the organization, and its conception of capability regarding sustainability. Organizational culture needs to become imbued with a sustainability focus, and values in relation to ecological sustainability need to be integrated throughout the organization. As Jermier and Forbes (2003) caution, organizations are not uniform integrated systems, where culture is identified as a consistent, organization-wide force managed by top management initiatives. There will be ambiguity as well as homogeneity within various sub cultural groups.

HRD practice

Culture and leadership are seen to be central facets in enabling the development of creative business strategies for ecological sustainability. A shift towards a more sustainable orientated culture needs to focus on behaviours and attitudes; both core belief structures and core values are likely to need to be transformed (Parkes and Borland, 2012). Staff

require the capabilities required to manage ecological outcomes of decisions, and these should include 'systems thinking, teamwork, critical thinking, reflection, collaboration, individual self-knowledge and awareness of values' (Kramar, 2014, p.1074-5). Leadership for sustainability may require new leadership styles and competencies. Hatcher (2002) for example argues that sustainability leadership needs a shift from transactional to transformational, ethical and values-based leadership. IHRD needs to seek stakeholder involvement in the development of reflective leaders who exhibit critical and creative thinking and partnership working, and focus on the long-term (Williams & Turnbull 2015). Sustainability requires leadership capabilities to support learning across boundaries and create new networks, and bridges between different communities or islands of knowledge (Clarke & Room, 1999).

Ranciere (in Gershon, 2012) notes that efforts to gain consensus between parties usually seek to integrate views from different parties and limit polarization, but that this results in narrowing of perspectives and abandoning different options. He proposes a perspective of dissensus to allow 'the possibility for inclusion of multiple even contrary perspectives ...without the need to reduce discussion to only those with whom one's perspective resonates' (Gershon, 2012, p. 367). As Castle and Culver (2013) argue, efforts to gain consensus often fail to address deep disputes about knowledge values and policy goals. They note 'policy problems of great social significance and of large scale and complexity typically defy easy expression' (Castle & Culver, 2013, p. 35). They introduce a method of *contested exchange* as a model in policy making, which focuses on multiple and marginalized perspectives, enriched by multidisciplinary frames of reference.

Learning focus

In seeking sustainability, learning is central to address problems involving the interaction of ecological, social and economic systems, high levels of uncertainty and long time horizons (Siebenhuner & Arnold, 2007). This requires deuterio learning - 'an improvement in organizational learning processes themselves' (Cramer 2005, p. 58). Learning is required at individual, group and organization levels (Gloet 2006). There is a need to foster multilevel thinking, involving collaboration across traditional, professional and functional boundaries, and linking link local, regional and global perspectives (Siebenhuner & Arnold, 2007). Learning processes need to support the development of shared understandings and 'transdisciplinary synthesis of perspectives' (Castle & Culver, 2013, p. 39). Interdisciplinary and intersectoral discussion can expose gaps, highlight different perspectives, help to develop a shared vocabulary.

Ardichvili and Kuchinke (2002) argue for the need to create interpretive spaces for mutual meaning making through collaborative learning. They advocate using appreciative enquiry and perspective-taking in cross-cultural settings to involve different actors holding competing definitions of a problem. This approach seeks to promote mutual learning and understanding across cultural contexts.

Gloet (2006) discusses *boundary - spanning learning*, arguing that 'knowledge of sustainability highlights the need for new knowledge, the new ways of managing knowledge and for new work practices to support this process' (p. 403). This requires includes a willingness to engage in alliances with other firms and/or environmental groups and NGOs (Neale, 1997).) This could foster the creation of networks which connect staff with external stakeholders, as suggested by Fenwick (2007). Clarke and Roome (1999) promote 'learning action networks ... a set of relationships which lay over and complement formal organizational structures linking individuals together by the flow of knowledge, information and ideas' (p. 297). These are supported by network-like structures and bridges 'involves learning and action by many people in the company and by many people and organizations in the company's 'stakeholder field'' (Clarke & Roome, 1995, p. 307). Collaborative social learning can help to build resilience and develop adaptive capacity. Triple loop learning sets learning within the social and political context (McCarthy et al, 2011).

The approach of *problematization* involves identifying and challenging the assumptions underlying existing theories (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011). IHRD professionals can encourage reflexive learning, in which staff 'learn to question and challenge everyday practices or social arrangements by discussing with others the extent to which they can be justified' and challenge 'rules of debate, argument assessment, and decision-making processes that the dominant culture favours' (Brookfield, 2005, p. 249-250). Problem-posing education, as advocated by Freire (1972), should encourage questioning, the development of critical understanding of a 'moving and changing' material reality (Allman, 1988, p. 96). The role for the IHRD professionals is one of seeking relevant resources (literature, case studies, invited speakers), posing challenging questions and facilitating dialogue. They should work in collaboration with learners 'to create a more complex way of understanding' (Allman, 1988, p. 97).

Critique of Transformational green IHRD.

As Baek & Kim (2014) argue, the triple bottom line 'indicates a paradigm shift in HRD's philosophy from one of narrow, business focused interests to a broader, planet focused approach' (p.501). The notion of transformational green IHRD is a call to

reposition IHRD. A particular feature is a rethinking of the close alignment of IHRD with business interests, as in strategic IHRD. Commenting on the HRD contribution to the recent financial crisis, MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery (2012) argue that the performance orientation of HRD resulted in a coupling of HRD with misaligned social objectives in many financial organizations, leading to dire consequences. They note that 'the irony is that in the push to think, act and positioned strategically, HRD arguably has lost its ability to critically reflect and see beyond the next financial quarter' (MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery 2012:357-8). To avoid this happening, HRD needs to engage in 'strategic decoupling'. This will enable it to develop a necessary distance, from which it must engage in critical reflection on organizational values and actions. This can contribute to 'the development of *human* intellectual capital that is ethically cognizant, organizationally aware and socially responsible' (MacKenzie, Garavan & Carbery 2012:359). This argument for strategic decoupling can equally be applied the development of green IHRD.

A core function of green IHRD is that of helping organizations engage in transformational change (Sadler-Smith 2015). Gubbins & Garavan (2009) note the need for HRD professionals to develop global mind-sets, arguing that HRD has moved from an activity based to a results based role, from transactional to transformational. Social capital and social networking competency are also increasingly important in the HRD role; in what they term 'the transformational HRD professional' (Gubbins & Garavan 2009 p. 265).

The transformational green IHRD orientation ostensibly presents the most challenges to IHRD 'business as usual'. But it also presents an opportunity for IHRD to get ahead of the game and position itself to make a meaningful contribution to organization practices of sustainability. The focus on deep learning and reflection, critical thinking, collaboration, stakeholder engagement and boundary-spanning learning, together with an emphasis on organizational culture change and the development of sustainability-focused leadership, provide openings for organization to address sustainability in more meaningful ways. Some organizations may embrace the opportunities provided by these approaches. Others may be reluctant or even hostile. What cannot be in doubt is that at various points in the future all organizations will need to adapt.

Having explored different possible approaches to green IHRD through the posited three domains – tactical, strategic, and transformational – the chapter now goes on to draw out the implications for IHRD research and practice.

Implications for IHRD Research and Practice.

Implications for IHRD practice

IHRD focus on sustainability involves learning and development interventions to facilitate individual learning and the encouragement of an organizational culture that prioritises sustainability. The HRD implications of sustainability in the different countries of operation of global businesses need to be ascertained, particularly through strategies for facilitate greater shared sustainability learning between the various companies and countries that might be involved, either as members of a global corporation or as stakeholders of an international business. Learning interventions can aim to increase intercultural awareness regarding sustainability, and serve to strengthen the corporate glue with a sustainability focus (Walton 1999).

Haddock et al. (2010) note three aspects to green HRD, which has a useful strategic focus, as it proposes analysis, planning and supporting: mapping – identifying where the organization and HRD currently stands regarding green practices; nurturing – stimulating new possibilities; and nourishing – sustaining change and generating future action.

This could form a basis for a planning framework for green IHRD, along with Garavan & McGuire's (2010) levels of foundation, traction, and integration. A strategic HRD contribution to sustainability includes a strategic planning process - policies, strategies, and action plans, monitoring and reporting, and learning and culture change programmes to develop organizational resilience (Neale, 1997). As a starting point there could be a strategic analysis process of organizational and environmental analysis (a green SWOT and PESTLE analysis, stakeholder analysis, cultural analysis, etc). This would assess the organization's TBL sustainability focus, and leadership sustainability competencies. It could incorporate a sustainability learning and training needs analysis.

It would involve assessing the particular IHRD structure and strategy for HR/D, according to the stage of internationalization of the business. IHRD strategies of firms are influenced by context, including national, sectoral and organizational factors (Boxall & Purcell 2000). IHRD needs to be cognisant of the the stage of development of HRD which varies from country to country (Wang & McLean, 2007). Factors such as national culture, national institutions, industry sectors and the wider business environment will impact on

firms, (Garavan & Carbery, 2012) must be taken into account in developing an IHRD focus on sustainability. As McGuire (2014) argues, the internationalization process is a complex, multi-stage and evolving process, organizations will take different approaches at any one time, stakeholders will vary, and the role and actors in IHRD will vary. For example, McGuire (2014) presents a framework describing four phases of internationalization - multi-domestic, international, multinational and transnational - and outlining structural issues, cultural issues, and the HRD priorities under each phase.

The Green IHRD conceptual framework provides a basis for reflection on the analysis, and consideration of the nature and scope of potential IHRD interventions to support organizational learning regarding sustainability. This needs to be contextualized within the particular business, countries of operation, and organizational structures and processes. It is likely that the most common scenario identified initially will be somewhere between a tactical and strategic focus on sustainability. The goal of IHRD will be to consolidate training for sustainability as noted under the Tactical Green IHRD mode, and move towards a Strategic focus for green IHRD. It can then start to incorporate some of the ideas for transformational learning that are listed under Transformational green IHRD, to help the organization develop deeper learning processes. There will be tensions between short and longer term goals, and a blend of IHRD practices will be needed, particularly ones that are dynamic and responsive (Boxall & Purcell 2000).

Implications for IHRD research

As regards implications for green IHRD research, there is a pressing need for more research in this domain. Conceptual research would be useful to help guide future research and practice. This might usefully build further on the research into green HRD generally, which this chapter has aimed to do. This would involve further mapping of IHRD frameworks and models onto green HRD and building on conceptual frameworks of green HRD and IHRD.

Research is not value –neutral. The three knowledge constitutive interests incorporate into the Green IHRD conceptual framework in this chapter highlights differing assumptions that underpin IHRD research, and will lead to different research foci and practices. Research from a tactical green IHRD perspective could be useful in providing descriptive/analytical insights into green HRD practices. This could include examining how organizations are starting out on introducing a green perspective to IHRD, and explanation and analysis of training and development interventions informed by sustainability concerns.

A technical-rationalist approach to research limits the potential for ethical considerations regarding the object of study (Alvesson & Willmott 2012) (although it may well comply with ethical guidelines for research practice – it is not in this sense intrinsically unethical).

A strategic green IHRD focus informing research could focus on a range of aspects, such as: emerging best practices in green IHRD; analyzing the application of SHRD to incorporate a sustainability focus to IHRD; how organizations engage with stakeholders to address green issues in an international context; how learning for and about sustainability is carried out in different organizational contexts; international comparative perspectives on green IHRD.

A transformative-informed green IHRD research open the door for exploratory, interdisciplinary studies. This must challenge conventional wisdom, explore alternatives, involve a wide range of stakeholders, especially those marginalized or ignored, examine ways in which IHRD practices can provide spaces for reflection, collaborative learning and creativity. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009) distinguish between ‘data-driven’ and ‘insight-driven’ research, of which there is need for both in green IHRD. Empirically based research informed by emancipatory reason is reflexive and recognizes ‘that ‘data’ are not regarded as ‘raw’ but as a construction of the empirical conditions, imbued with consistent interpretive work’ (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2009 p 283-4). Insight-driven research pays more attention to the interpretive processes. Research approaches can be informed by dissensus, seeking to draw out competing perspectives. Problematization in research involves identification and challenge of assumptions underlying existing theories, to help to generate novel research questions, as an alternative to the common approach of seeking gaps in current research (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011).

Conclusions

Developing an approach to green IHRD is not an optional choice for IHRD – sustainability is an increasingly important issue for organizations and for societies. To date there has been little literature exploring green IHRD. Whilst there may be some innovative if little documented practice, IHRD has generally been slow to grasp the mantle of sustainability. Developing green IHRD theory and practice presents both challenges and opportunities to IHRD. A particular challenge is to the strategic business partner role of IHRD, which has aligned HRD too closely with the interests of the organization rather than the environment. Developing sustainable practice presents multiple challenges to

organizations, and these will be reflected as challenges for developing green IHRD. However, if IHRD does not engage more actively in the sustainability agenda, it risks becoming marginalized and less relevant to organizational concerns and practices.

Green IHRD presents an opportunity for IHRD to build on its strengths in supporting individual and organizational development, learning and change. IHRD is well placed to take a leadership role in sustainability, with its expertise in sustaining learning. Not only will this ensure greater organizational relevance for IHRD, it will also help to address the ethical tensions inherent in the HRD profession and in practice, reflected (simplistically but strikingly) in the 'people vs performance' or 'organization versus environment' dichotomies.

The conceptual framework and discussion presented in this chapter provides some pointers for positioning and developing green IHRD practice and research. The arguments presented here suggest that research and practice within a framework of technical reason is insufficient to address the complex challenges to IHRD presented by sustainability. Practical reason can provide useful pointers for development of theory and practice in green IHRD. But IHRD can make a particular contribution if practice and research is informed by emancipatory reason and the promotion and support of collaborative and critical learning processes.

References

- Ahlstrom, J., Maquet, M., & Richter, U. (2009), "The lack of a critical perspective in environmental management research: distortion in the scientific discourse", *Business Strategy and the Environment*, **18**(5), 334-346.
- Allman, P. (1988, 'Gramsci, Freire and Illich: Their Contributions to Education for Socialism', in Tom Lovett (Ed.), *Radical approaches to adult education: A reader*, (New York, NY: Routledge. pp. 85-113.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011), 'Generating research questions through problematization', *Academy of Management Review*, **36**(2), 247-271.
- Alvesson, M. & Skoldberg, K. (2009) *Reflexive Methodology: New vistas for qualitative research* 2nd edition, London: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, V. (2015), 'International HRD and offshore outsourcing: A conceptual review and research agenda', *Human Resource Development Review* **14**(3), 259-278
- Ardichvili, A. (2013), 'The role of HRD in CSR, sustainability, and ethics: A relational model', *Human Resource Development Review*, **12**(4), 456-473.

Ardichvili, A. & Kuchinke, P.K (2002) the concept of culture in International and comparative HRD research: methodological problems and possible solutions, *human resource development review* 1(2) 145-188

Baek, P. & Kim, N. (2014), 'Exploring the theoretical foundation for HRD in society: towards the model of stakeholder-based HRD', *Human Resource Development International*, **17**(5), 499-513

Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. (2000), 'Strategic human resource management: where have we come from and where should we be going?', *International Journal of Management Reviews* **2** (2), 183-2-3.

Brookfield, S. D. (2005), *The power of critical theory for adult learning and teaching*, New York, NY: Open University Press.

Carrington, D. (2016). 'Climate change will blow a \$2.5tn. holes in global financial assets, study warns', *The Guardian* Monday 4 April

Castle, D., & Culver, K. (2013), 'Getting to 'No': The method of contested exchange', *Science and Public Policy*, **40**(1), 34–42.

Cherian, J. & Jacob, J. (2012), 'A study of Green HR practices and it's effective implementation in the organization: a review', *International Journal of Business and Management*, **7**(21).

Clarke, S., & Roome, N. (1999), 'Sustainable business: Learning-action networks as organizational asset', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, **8**(5), 296-310.

Clegg, S., Kornberger, M., & Pitsis, T. (2011), *Managing and organization*, London: Sage Publications.

Colbert, B.A. & Kurucz, E.C. (2007), 'Three conceptions of Triple Bottom Line business sustainability and the role for HRM', *Human Resource Planning*, **30** (1) 21-29

Cramer, J. (2005), 'Company learning about corporate social responsibility', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, **14**(4), 255-266.

Elkington, J. (2004), 'Enter the triple bottom line', in A. Henriques, & J. Richardson (Eds.), *The triple bottom line: Does it all add up?*, London: Earthscan, pp.1-16.

Fenwick, T. (2007), 'Developing organizational practices of ecological sustainability: A learning perspective', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, **28** (7), 632-645.

Fenwick, T., & Bierema, L. (2008), 'Corporate social responsibility: issues for human resource development professionals', *International Journal of Training and Development*, **12**(1), 24–35.

Ferdig, M. A. (2007), 'Sustainability leadership: co-creating a sustainable future', *Journal of Change Management*, **7**(1), 25-35.

Freire, P. (1972), *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, Harmondsworth: Penguin books.

Garavan, T.N. & Carbery, R. (2012), 'A review of international HRD: incorporating a global HRD construct', *European Journal of Training and Development*, **36** (2/3), 129-157.

Garavan, T.N., Heraty, N, Rock, A & Dalton, E. (2010), 'Conceptualizing the behavioural barriers CSR and CS in the organizations: a typology of HRD interventions', *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, **12** (5), 586-613.

Garavan, T.N. & McGuire, D. (2010), 'Human resource development and society: human resource development role in embedding corporate social responsibility, sustainability, and ethics in organizations', *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, **12** (5), 487-507.

Garrity, E. J. (2012), 'Tragedy of the commons, business growth and the fundamental sustainability problem', *Sustainability*, **4** (12), 2443–2471.

Gershon, W. S. (2012), 'Troubling notions of risk: dissensus, dissonance, and making sense of students and learning', *Critical Studies in Education*, **53**(3), 361–373.

Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T. S. (1995), 'Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: implications for management theory and research' *Academy of Management Review*, **20** (4), 874-907.

Gloet, M. (2006), 'Knowledge management and the links to HR', *Management Research News*, **29** (7), 402–413.

Gubbins, C. & Garavan, T.N. (2009), 'Understanding the HRD role in MNCs: the imperatives of social capital and networking', *Human Resource Development Review*, **8** (2), 245-275

Habermas, J. (1972), *Knowledge and Human Interest*, London: Heinemann.

Haddock, J., Jeffrey, J., Miles, D., Muller-Camen, M. & Hartog, M. (2010), 'Green HRD: the potential contribution of HRD concepts and theories to environmental management', Paper presented at 11th *International conference on HRD Research and Practice across Europe*, Pecs, Hungary.

Hahn, T., & Figge, F. (2011), 'Beyond the bounded instrumentality in current corporate sustainability research: toward an inclusive notion of profitability', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **104** (3), 325–345.

Harris, H., Brewster, C. & Sparrow, P. (2003), *International Human Resource Management*, London: CIPD.

Harris, C. & Tregidga, H. (2012), 'HR managers and environmental sustainability: strategic leaders or passive observers?', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **23** (2), 236-254.

Hatcher, T. (2002), *Ethics and HRD*, Cambridge MA: Basic Books.

Jackson, S.E., Renwick, D.W.S., Jabbour, C.J.C & Muller-Camen, M. (2011) State-of-the-art and future directions for green human resource management: introduction to special issue, *Zitschrift fur Personalforschung*, 25(2) 99-116

Jermier, J. M., & Forbes, L. C. (2003), 'Greening organizations: critical issues', In M. Alvesson, & H. Willmott (Eds), *Studying Management Critically*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 157-176.

Kopnina, H. (2013). Forsaking nature? Contesting 'biodiversity' through competing discourses of sustainability. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development*, 7(1), 51–63.

Kramar, R. (2014), 'Beyond strategic human resource management: is sustainable human resource management the next approach?' *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(8) 1069-1089.

Kurucz, E. C., Colbert, B. A., & Marcus, J. (2014), 'Sustainability as a provocation to rethink management education: Building a progressive educative practice', *Management Learning*, 45 (4), 437–457.

Lockwood, N. R. (2004), 'Corporate social responsibility: HR's leadership role', *Society for Human Resource Management Research Quarterly*, 49 (2), 1-10.

Mankin, D. (2009), *Human Resource Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCarthy, D. D. P., Crandall, D. D., Whitelaw, G. S., Zachariah General, & Truji, L. J. S. (2011), 'A critical systems approach to social learning: building adaptive capacity in social, ecological, epistemological (SEE) systems', *Ecology and Society*, 16 (3), 18.

MacKenzie, C.A., Garavan, T.N. & Carbery, R. (2012), 'Through the looking Glass: challenges for human resource development (HRD) post the global Financial crisis - Business as usual?', *Human Resource Development International*, 15 (3), 353-364.

McCracken, M., & Wallace, M. (2000), 'Towards a re-definition of strategic HRD', *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 24 (5), 281.

McGuire, D. (2014), *Human resource development 2nd ed*, London: Sage Publications.

Neale A. (1997), 'Organizational learning in contested environments: lessons from Brent Spar', *Business Strategy and Environment*, 6 (2), 93-103.

Newton, T. (2009), '*Organizations and the natural environment*', In M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman & H. Willmott, *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp.125-143.

Parkes, C. & Borland, H. (2012), 'Strategic HRM: transforming its responsibilities toward ecological sustainability - the greatest global challenge facing organizations', *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 54 (6), 811-824.

Quairel-Lanoizelée, F. (2011), 'Are competition and corporate social responsibility compatible?', *Society and Business Review*, 6 (1), 77–98.

Rimanoczy, I., & Pearson, T. (2010), 'Role of HR in the new world of sustainability', *Industrial and Commercial Training*, **42** (1), 11–17.

Sanders, P. (2012), 'Is CSR cognizant of the conflictuality of globalisation? A realist critique', *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, **8** (2), 157–177.

Sadler-Smith, E. (2015), 'Communicating Climate change risk and enabling pro-environmental behavioral change through human resource development', *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, **17** (4), 442-459

Schramm, J. (2008), 'Sustainable strategy', *HR Magazine*, September.

Scully-Russ, E. (2012). Human resource development and sustainability: Beyond sustainable organizations. *Human Resource Development International*, **15**(4), 399–415.

Scully-Russ, E. (2015) The contours of green human resource development, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, **17**(4) 411-425

Shrivastava, P. (1995), 'The role of corporations in achieving ecological sustainability', *Academy of Management Review*, **20** (4), 936-960.

Siebenhuner, B., & Arnold, M. (2007), 'Organizational learning to manage sustainable development', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, **16** (5), 339-353.

Simon, H. A. (1991), 'Bounded rationality and organizational learning', *Organization Science*, **2** (1), 125-134.

Slaper, T. F., & Hall, T. J. (2011), 'The Triple bottom line: what is it and how does it work?', *Indiana Business Review*, **86** (1), 4-8.

Valentin, C. (2015), 'Greening HRD: conceptualizing the triple bottom line for HRD practice, teaching, and research', *Advances in Developing Human Resources* **17**(4) 1-16.

Walton, J. (1999), *Strategic Human Resource Development*, Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.

Wang, X. & McLean, G.N. (2007), 'The dilemma of defining international human research development', *Human Resource Development Review*, **6** (1) 96-108.

Williams, S. & Turnbull, S. (2015), 'Developing the next generation greatly responsible leaders: generation Y perspectives and the implications for green HRD', *Advances in Developing Human Resources* **17** (4), 504-521.

Willmott, H. (2003), 'Organization theory as critical science? Forms of analysis and 'new organizational forms' in H. Tsoukas, & C. Knudsen (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.1-36.

World Commission on Environment and Development, (1987), *Our Common Future*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, (Also known as the Brundtland report).